

REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 1, 3, 4, 11 and 19, leaves claims 2, 5-10 and 12-14 unchanged and adds new claim 20. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 1-14, 19 and 20.

The present Amendment is being submitted as discussed during the December 6, 2007 Interview and so as to further amend the claims to more clearly describe features of the present invention not taught or suggested by any of the references of record whether said references are taken individually or in combination with each other. The present Amendment being supplement to the October 15, 2007 Amendment incorporates the contents of the Remarks of said Amendment.

In the Remarks of the October 15, 2007 Amendment numerous arguments were presented distinguishing the features of the present invention from the Arimilli (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0009640); Moran (U.S. Patent No. 7,139,890) and Matsumoto (U.S. Patent No. 5,737,522) references, said arguments as noted above are incorporated herein by reference.

Further, to said arguments, amendments were made to the claims as set forth in the present Amendment. Particularly, these amendments amend the claims in a manner so as to more clearly recite that the present invention provides a primary network which connects the at least one client and the relay device to each other and a secondary network which connects the relay device and the storage device to each other. Additionally these amendments amend the claims in a manner so as to more clearly recite that the present invention provides that a plurality of virtual volumes are formed on the

physical devices, and each of the at least one client is assigned to at least one of the virtual volumes, thereby permitting each of the at least one client to access data stored in the at least one of the virtual volumes to which it is assigned.

Still further, to said arguments, a dependent claim was added as set forth in the present Amendment. Particularly, the dependent claims recites that the present invention provides that the primary network and the second network are different from each other.

The above described features of the present invention now clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record whether said references are taken individually or in combination with each other. At no point is there any teaching or suggestion in any of the references of the above described primary and secondary networks, nor that a plurality of virtual volumes are formed on the physical devices, and each of the at least one client is assigned to at least one of the virtual volumes, thereby permitting each of the at least one client to access data stored in the at least one of the virtual volumes to which it is assigned as now more clearly recited in the claims.

As previously argued in the Remarks of the October 15, 2007 Amendment, at no point is there any teaching or suggestion in Arimilli of a data caching control method or apparatus which makes use of a relay device in a system, wherein the client and the relay device are connected on a primary network and the relay device and the storage system are connected on a secondary network as in the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims. There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion of a

cache disk module in the network switch 15 nor data caching control in the network switch 15 of Arimilli as alleged by the Examiner.

The above described deficiencies of Arimilli are also evident in Moran. Moran merely discloses a memory 130 in a hub connected processor 100 and an I/O device 150. However, at no point is there any teaching or suggestion in Moran of a relay device connected between a client and a storage device as in the present invention as recited in the claims. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion in Moran that the client is connected to the relay device by a primary network and that the relay device is connected to the storage by a secondary network as in the present invention as recited in the claims.

Therefore, based on the described arguments and the numerous arguments provided in the October 15, 2007 Amendment, said arguments being incorporated by reference, it is quite clear that the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record particularly Arimilli, Moran, Benantar and Matsumoto whether said references are taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner.

Thus, each of Arimilli, Moran, Benantar and Matsumoto fails to teach or suggest a relay device which relays data between said storage device and the at least one client, said relay device including a cache disk module for caching processed data being relayed between said storage device and said at least one client as recited in the claims.

Further, each of Arimilli, Moran, Benantar and Matsumoto fails to teach or suggest relating data processed in the computer system with attribute data

which configures a caching operation of the cache disk module that caches the processed data on a primary network which connects said at least one client and said relay device to each other as recited in the claims.

Still further, each of Arimilli, Moran, Benantar and Matsumoto fails to teach or suggest mediating the processed data between the storage device and the at least one client device via a secondary network, which connects said relay device and said storage device to each other, without the caching operation of the cache disk module when the attribute data prohibits the caching operation as recited in the claims.

Still further yet, each of Arimilli, Moran, Benantar and Matsumoto fails to teach or suggest a plurality of virtual volumes are formed on said physical devices, and each of said at least one client is assigned to at least one of said virtual volumes, thereby permitting said each of said at least one client to access data stored in said at least one of said virtual volumes to which it is assigned as recited in the claims.

Therefore, since each of Arimilli, Moran, Benantar and Matsumoto fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now recited in the claims, combining Arimilli with Moran and one or more of Benantar and Matsumoto does not render obvious the claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the various 35 USC §103(a) rejections of claims are respectfully requested.

As indicated above, the present Amendment adds new claim 20. New claim 20 depends from claim 1 and describes the primary and secondary networks as being different from each other. These features are also are not taught or suggested by the references of record.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that claims 1-14, 19 and 20 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 1-14, 19 and 20 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (1288.43131X00).

Respectfully submitted,
MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

/Carl I. Brundidge/
Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 684-1120